

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR - 6 2012

*Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary*

In the Matter of)	
)	
Amendment of Section 73.202(b),)	
Table of Allotments,)	MB Docket No. 11-207
FM Broadcast Stations)	RM-11517
)	
(Ehrenberg, Munds Park, Kachina Village,)	
Wickenburg, and Williams, Arizona))	
)	RM-11518
(Ehrenberg, Munds Park, and Kachina)	
Village,)	and
Arizona))	
)	File No. BPH-20080915AFP
Application of)	
Univision Radio License Corporation)	
KHOV-FM, Wickenburg, Arizona)	

**To: Office of the Secretary
Attn: Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau**

REPLY COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COUNTERPROPOSAL

Univision Radio License Corporation ("Univision"), licensee of KHOV-FM ("KHOV"), Wickenburg, Arizona, by its attorneys, respectfully submits its reply comments with regard to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order to Show Cause, DA 11-2058 (rel. Dec. 23, 2011) (the "NPRM"), in the captioned proceeding. These reply comments respond to the Counterproposal and Response to Order to Show Cause of Grenax Broadcasting II, LLC ("Grenax"), filed on February 21, 2012, which proposes to allot Channel 246C2 to Munds Park, Arizona, and substitute Channel 281C for Channel 247C at First Mesa, Arizona, in order to accommodate the Munds Park allotment (the "Munds Park Counterproposal"). The Commission should reject the

No. of Copies rec'd. 044
List ABOVE

Munds Park Counterproposal because it is mutually exclusive with and clearly inferior under the FM Allotment Priorities to the proposal embodied in Univision's Petition and hybrid Application (the "Wickenburg Petition and Application"), which proposes to upgrade KHOV from channel 287C2 to channel 286C0.¹

The Munds Park Counterproposal and the Wickenburg Petition and Application are mutually exclusive. As a result, the Commission must apply the FM Allotment Priorities. Attached as an Exhibit hereto is an engineering analysis with respect to the Munds Park Counterproposal prepared by Univision's consulting engineer, Charles Staples, of CS Broadcast Technical Services, Inc., using V-Soft Communications Probe 4 software and incorporating 2010 U.S. Census data. Univision previously provided an engineering analysis of the Wickenburg Petition and Application at Exhibit 1 of its opening Comments and Response to Order to Show Cause, filed on February 21, 2012, and incorporated herein by reference.² Using these data and applying the FM Allotment Priorities, it is clear that the Wickenburg Petition and Application better serves the public interest.

First, the Wickenburg Petition and Application is entitled to preference pursuant to Priority 2.³ The Wickenburg Petition and Application will result in new second service to 1,428 people, while the Munds Park Counterproposal cannot result in

¹ To Univision's knowledge, Rocket Radio, Inc. ("Rocket Radio"), the former proponent of the mutually exclusive reallocation of Channel 287C2 to Williams, Arizona, did not file comments in response to the NPRM. Univision reserves the right to respond to any filing by Rocket Radio that may be made in this proceeding.

² As explained there, Exhibit 1 to Univision's Comments and Response to Order to Show Cause consists of Exhibit 1A, which illustrates the total service that would result from the Wickenburg Petition and Application, and Exhibit 1B, which illustrates the present KHOV service. The new service that would result from the Wickenburg Petition and Application is calculated by subtracting the figures in Exhibit 1B from those in Exhibit 1A.

³ Neither proposal offers a first service or a first local service, so only Priority 2 (second service) and Priority 4 (other public interest) will be discussed.

second service to anyone. This is a dispositive preference justifying grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application and rejection of the Munds Park Counterproposal.

Second, even if the Wickenburg Petition and Application does not prevail under Priority 2 alone, it is superior when evaluated under the broad public interest rubric of Priority 4. Grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application will result in a substantially higher level of service than the Munds Park Counterproposal to underserved areas. Specifically, grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application will result in new third service to 840 people, new fourth service to 58 people, and new fifth through ninth service to 294 people. In contrast, the Munds Park Counterproposal *will not result in third through ninth service to anyone*. The Commission has stated that heightened emphasis under Priority 4 is given to service to underserved areas, so these data strongly support a conclusion that the Wickenburg Petition and Application is superior.

NPRM, ¶ 9.

Furthermore, grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application would result in substantially greater public interest benefits because it will result in overall new service to more than 10 times more people than the Munds Park Counterproposal. Specifically, grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application will result in new service to an additional 1,258,966 people, a figure that dwarfs the 117,851 people who could receive service from the Munds Park Counterproposal. This huge disparity clearly demonstrates that grant of the Wickenburg Petition and Application would better serve the public interest.

Finally, the fact that the Munds Park Counterproposal would provide second local service to the 631 individuals who reside in Munds Park, Arizona, also does

not warrant a preference because this level of service is *de minimis* and not worthy of consideration in the Commission's Priority 4 analysis.⁴ Further, Grenax has failed to overcome the presumption that its counterproposal, which it acknowledges would result in service to more than fifty percent of an urbanized area, is intended to serve the entire Flagstaff urbanized area rather than the "community" of First Munds.⁵ In this regard, Grenax argues that the fact that many Munds Parks homes are owned by part-year residents suggests that it is an independent community. But Grenax misapprehends the import of this fact; to the contrary, it demonstrates that Munds Park lacks the stable indigenous population necessary for it to be treated as a genuine community separate from Flagstaff. *See* Munds Park Counterproposal at 4.

* * *

The Wickenburg Petition and Application is superior to the Munds Park Counterproposal both because it will result in a new second through ninth aural service to many people, while the Munds Park Counterproposal will not result in a new second through ninth aural service to anyone, *and* because the Wickenburg Petition and Application will result in a new aural service to more than ten times as many people. Accordingly, for all the reasons stated above and in Univision's opening Comments and Response to Order to Show Cause, the Commission should adopt the changes to the FM

⁴ The population figure of 631 derives from the 2010 U.S. Census. *See* Munds Park Counterproposal at 4. Grenax resists using this figure and instead argues that the Commission should employ a higher population figure contained in the "Pinewood-Munds Park Guide." *See id.* Grenax fails to identify the source of the "Pinewood-Munds Park Guide" or explain its methodology. Of course, an apparently local provider of information has many incentives to inflate the local population figure. Rather than employ a source of unknown quality simply because it provides a number more favorable to Grenax, the Commission should instead employ the reliably and impartially calculated figure contained in the 2010 U.S. Census, as is standard Commission practice.

⁵ By the calculations of Univision engineering consultant Charles Staples, the Munds Park Counterproposal's city grade contour would cover 98.1 percent of the Flagstaff urbanized area. Moreover, the Flagstaff urbanized area is 71.7 percent of the population of the city grade of the proposed facility's overall coverage.

Table of Allotments proposed in the Wickenburg Petition and grant the associated Application. Univision further requests that the Commission deny the mutually exclusive Munds Park Counterproposal and the mutually exclusive Williams Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

**UNIVISION RADIO LICENSE
CORPORATION**

By: 

Mace Rosenstein
Daniel H. Kahn

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2401
(202) 662-6000

Its Counsel

March 6, 2012

EXHIBIT

Service Count Population Report - Service Count: 1488389.A (246):
 Circle R = 52.02 km

Reference Area: 1488389.A (246): Circle R = 52.02 km
 Counting Grid Cell Size: 0.5 sq. km
 Population Database: 2010 US Census (PL)

Services Included in Count:

1488389.A (246): Circle R = 52.02 km
 KNAU (204): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KJZA (208): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KJTA (210): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KGCB (215): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KPUB (219): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KAFF-FM (225): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KMGH (230): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KVIB (236): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KKLD (240): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KWMX (244): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KMVA (248): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KKFR (252): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KZXX (255): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KVNA-FM (261): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KNRJ (266): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KAHM (271): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KQST (275): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KZGL (279): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KAJM (282): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KBTK (286): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KVRD-FM (289): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KFSZ (291): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KPPV (294): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KSED (298): FCC F(50-50) 60.00 dBu (FCC HAAT)
 KAZM : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KMOG : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KYBC : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KBMB : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KQNA : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KINO : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KAFF : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KVNA : Imported: 2.0 mV/m
 KYET : Imported: 2.0 mV/m

Count Area	Population	Housing Units	Area (sq. km)
1 Service	0	0	0.00
2 Service	0	0	0.00
3 Service	0	0	0.00
4 Service	0	0	0.00
5 Service	0	0	0.00
6 Service	0	0	0.00
7 Service	0	0	7.40
8 Service	0	0	7.35
9 Service	0	0	6.65
10 Service	175	427	66.59
11 Service	131	308	93.43
12 Service	16	5	136.92

13 or more	117,851	58,926	8184.40
Reference Area	118,173	59,666	8502.74
	Service Pop	Running Total	Percent
1 Service	0	0	0.0 %
2 Service	0	0	0.0 %
3 Service	0	0	0.0 %
4 Service	0	0	0.0 %
5 Service	0	0	0.0 %
6 Service	0	0	0.0 %
7 Service	0	0	0.0 %
8 Service	0	0	0.0 %
9 Service	0	0	0.0 %
10 Service	175	175	0.1 %
11 Service	131	306	0.3 %
12 Service	16	322	0.3 %
13 or more	117,851	118,173	100.0 %

	Housing Units	Population
Arizona		
Coconino County		
Total	63,321	134,421
7 Service	0	0
9 Service	0	0
10 Service	427	175
11 Service	308	131
12 Service	5	16
13 or more	42,788	89,392
Reference Area	43,528	89,714
Yavapai County		
Total	110,432	211,033
13 or more	16,138	28,459
Reference Area	16,138	28,459

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lois N. Person, hereby certify that on this 6th day of March, 2012,
I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Reply Comments and Response to
Counterproposal to be delivered *via* first-class prepaid U.S. mail to the following:

M. Scott Johnson
Anne Goodwin Crump
Christine E. Goepp
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 N. 17th Street -- 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22209

Counsel to Grenax Broadcasting II, LLC

J. Dominic Monahan
Luvaas Cobb
The Forum Building
777 High Street, Suite 300
Eugene, OR 97401

Counsel to Rocket Radio, Inc.


Lois N. Person